DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 707 EC 031 983

AUTHOR Folman, R.; Budoff, Milton
TITLE Learning Potential Status and Vocational Interests and Aspirations of Special and Regular Class Adolescents. Volume 1, Number 7.
INSTITUTION Research Inst. for Educational Problems, Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Aspiration, *Educable Mentally Handicapped, *Exceptional Child Research, Junior High School Students, Learning Characteristics, Self Concept, *Vocational Interests

ABSTRACT

Junior highschool students in three special classes for the educable retarded and regular class children from three low-track sections were administered the Kohs block designs and assigned a learning potential status: highscorer, gainer, or nongainer. All subjects were then interviewed individually in a 1-hour session in which questions relating to vocational areas were asked. One third of the regular and special class students held after-school jobs and the majority aspired to jobs similar to those they expected to attain after leaving school. The special class sample, however, desired and expected to obtain lower level jobs than the regular class subjects. Within the special class sample, highscorers held low job aspirations, seemed most knowledgeable about reported choices giving the impression of a motivational pattern attuned to minimize failure. The nongainer (low able student according to the criteria) tended to respond more similarly to regular class students, but were not able to give any solid evidence of having tested the reality of the responses. Nongainers were viewed as functioning like a mentally retarded child while the highscorers and gainers were felt to be educationally retarded. (RJ)

EC031983

ED048707

STUDIES IN LEARNING POTENTIAL

LEARNING POTENTIAL STATUS AND VOCATIONAL INTERESTS AND ASPIRATIONS OF SPECIAL AND REGULAR CLASS ADOLESCENTS

By

R. Folman and M. Budoff

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC031983

Volume 1, Number 7

1970

Research Institute For Educational Problems
12 Maple Avenue Cambridge, Massachusetts

1

EC031983

ED 048707

LEARNING POTENTIAL STATUS AND VOCATIONAL INTERESTS AND ASPIRATIONS OF SPECIAL AND REGULAR CLASS ADOLESCENTS[1,2]

R. Folman and M. Budoff
Research Institute for Educational Problems

Adolescents share a concern with their future vocation and give considerable thought to plans for their future. The special class child classified as an educable mental retardate (EMR) is no exception. The question arises as to whether the retarded intellectual development attributed to the EMR is paralleled by a retarded vocational development. That is, whether and to what degree, the stages in vocational development among special class children overlap those of higher IQ children.

Ginzberg, Ginzberg, Axelrod and Herma (1951) described three periods in the development of occupational choice of children of average ability, of which only the first two stages were of concern to this study. During the "fantasy" period, extending to eleven years, the individual is motivated subjectively by hero figures; the child indulges in little reality testing of the appropriateness of his desire, and often little stability of choice. During the second period, extending from 11 to 17 years, the individual becomes aware of the qualifications required to attain specific positions. At 13 to 14 years, he considers ability and training; at 15 to 16 years he also considers personal values; and by 16 to 17 years he considers his ability and training, taking into account his personal values. Ginzberg et al. reported that adolescents more frequently

EC031983

state a vocational goal and tend to specify occupations (chemist rather than scientist), offer rational explanations to support their choice(s), and have more realistic conceptions of the preparations needed to attain the job.

Studies of the slow learner and the EMR indicate problems which hinder these students in developing realistic vocational goals (e.g., level of understanding, negative self concept, etc.). Kuhn (1966) interviewed junior high school EMRs, CA, and MA controls, and reported that EMRs have a significantly lower level of understanding of their selected future occupations than the other groups. Katzen (1966), working with EMR adolescents in a special class, found that the degree of realism in vocational preference was related to both IQ and degree of self acceptance. She found that for all subjects there was an inverse relationship between self acceptance and realism of vocational choice, whereas for boys only, the degree of realism was also a function of IQ (positive relationship). Jones (1967) also reported that the appropriateness of a subject's vocational preference increased with his IQ. Contrary to Katzen's findings, this relationship was true of both sexes. Although Jones found that in general girls were less realistic in their choices than boys, his results also indicated that there were more boys than girls with higher IQs. The sex difference might have disappeared if the scores had been adjusted for the differences in IQ. In addition to IQ, his results indicated that the degree of realism of vocational choice also increased with chronological age (based on high school EMRs between 13 and 21 years of age).

School achievement level also related to an individual's vocational aspirations. McCoy (1963) studying 10 to 15 year old children with IQs ranging from 50 to 80, found these Ss had unrealistically high self confidence for distant goals. Anderson and Brandt (1939), using normal fifth grade children, found that those Ss in the lowest ranks of achievement, consistently set their goals far above their past achievements, while those Ss who were in the highest ranks of achievement consistently set their goals considerably below their past achievements.

The present interview was developed to study further the differences in vocational development between special and regular class students from low income backgrounds. More specifically, the study was concerned with whether there would be differences in vocational development among adolescent EMR Ss consistent with their differences in learning potential status.

Budoff (1969a) described a learning potential assessment procedure, supplementary to the usual intelligence test, in which the student is pretested on a nonverbal reasoning task, then offered tuition on principles relevant to their solution, and finally retested on the task. Tuition is offered in a context of competence-inducing support. Three patterns of response to this type of assessment are evident within the EMR IQ range (60-80 IQ). Some Ss (high scorers) demonstrate excellent understanding on the trial prior to training, figuring out the problems as they proceed from easy to harder instances, and performing at levels typical of higher IQ children. Other Ss (gainers) perform poorly on the pretest administration, but do improve their scores markedly following instruction. The third group of Ss (nongainers) perform poorly initially and do not profit from the instructional procedure.

Various data available indicate that the improved ability displayed on the reasoning task is not task-specific, but that Ss differing in learning potential status demonstrate consistently different levels of competence on other psychometric and learning tasks, educational capability, and distinctive patterns on some motivational scales (Budoff, 1967; Budoff & Pagell, 1968; Budoff & Meskin, 1969; Harrison & Budoff, 1969). The pattern of these differences suggested the hypothesis that the high able learning potential (LP) child (high scorers and gainers) represent instances of severe educational handicap, while the uniformly poor performance of nongainers functionally defines them as mentally handicapped.

The interview data on vocational interests and aspirations, then,will also test this hypothesis. That is, it is hypothesized that the high able LP special class students will display behavior, interests and aspirations more characteristic of the regular class respondent, while the low able LP students' responses will differ, and reflect responses suggesting retarded development in the vocational area.

Method

Sample: The students were drawn from a junior high school whose students are low income Irish Americans. All students in the three special classes for the educable mentally retarded were included in the subject pool; the only exclusions were those with demonstrable cerebral involvements, or extreme emotional disturbances, i.e., having a suspicion of psychosis but not merely a severe behavior problem. The regular class children, who served as controls, were drawn from three seventh grade sections: a low academic track

section, and two low general track sections. All the children selected from these sections had failed two or more major subjects during the first marking period. While some Ss would improve their performance during the school year, it was felt that these students did represent an "at risk" population. These regular class Ss were, on an average, one year younger than the special class sample.

All the special and regular class students were administered the learning potential procedure using the Kohs block designs. This procedure involves three individual administrations of the sixteen test designs and five coaching designs: prior to instruction, one day, and then one month following coaching. A tuition session using five coaching designs is interpolated between the first two administrations (for details of the procedure, see Budoff & Friedman, 1964).

Based on the patterns of performance displayed on the learning potential task, the students were assigned a learning potential status. Students were considered gainers if they met the criterion of solving at least four more designs (excluding coaching designs) on the post-coaching sessions than on the pretest, an increase in score equal to three times the mean increase of the noncoached control group of a previous study (1.2 designs) (Budoff & Friedman, 1964; Budoff, 1967). High scorers successfully solved one of the difficult 9 or 16 block problems in the upper half of the test series prior to tuition, and were considered to have demonstrated learning potential by performing better than would be expected on the basis of their IQ rating. Nongainers included all those coached Ss whose pre- to posttest score change was less than four designs.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations for IQ, CA, and a measure of social class (rating of occupation of principal wage earner). It also presents a summary of the two-way analyses of variance of these variables for the two groups (EMR vs. NonEMR), each with three levels of learning potential).

Insert Table 1 about here

EMRs and nonEMRs differed significantly in IQ and CA as expected. LP groups also differed significantly in IQ, confirming the results of research on large EMR samples (Budoff, 1969b).

The occupations of the mothers and fathers of the children were obtained from the school records. The groups did not differ significantly in social class background as determined by rating the principal wage earner's occupation according to Turner's classification (Turner, 1964). It should be noted that the occupational ratings fell into the categories Turner designates as unskilled (1), semi- (2), or skilled (3) laborers.

The Interview: All the Ss were interviewed individually in a one hour session in which the questions relating to the vocational area were administered as part of a larger interview. Each question was read aloud by E and repeated if required.

The first part of the interview was concerned with present occupational status, i.e., which students reported they currently had after school jobs, and the degree of interest they expressed in these jobs. To obtain these measures, S was questioned on the type of job, method of obtaining it, length of employment and attitudes toward work itself.

In the second part, S was queried regarding those vocation(s) to which he aspired and those he actually expected to obtain, his perception of his parents' aspirations for him, and how realistic his plans were for the future. A measure of realism about his choice(s) was obtained from a series of questions:

1. S was required to describe the work involved in the job(s) he mentioned;

2. Asked to explain how he decided on this choice;

3. Asked questions seeking evidence of S's knowledge of the job, either indirectly through contact with friends or relatives presently engaged in it, or directly by having performed some of the tasks involved himself;

4. Based on the assumption that aspirations shared with others may indicate greater involvement, S was also questioned as to whether he had discussed his plans with family, teachers, or friends.

Results

Present after school employment, vocational aspiration-expectations and understanding of vocational choices will be discussed separately, first comparing regular and special class samples, then examining the important differences among LP groups within the special class sample. The results comparing LP groups among the regular class sample showed few differences and will not be discussed.

1. Present After School Employment

A. Special-Regular Class Comparison

There were very few differences between the special and regular class samples; a remarkable picture of similarity emerged

from the Ss' responses. One third of the Ss in both samples stated they were employed at the time of the interview. When the jobs they mentioned were rated (Turner's Prestige-Subcultural Scale of Occupations, 1964), most of the jobs cited by students in both samples (85%) were in the semi-skilled and skilled laborer categories; the remainder were categorized as lesser white collar occupations. More special than regular class students had held a previous job ($\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 3.34$, $\underline{p} < .07$), which may be explained in part by the fact that the special class group had a broader CA range, contained more older students and was, on the average, one year older. For the majority of those employed (50% and 76.6% of the EMRs and nonEMRs, respectively), the current position mentioned was their first one. All the Ss employed liked their jobs, 70% of both groups gave intrinsic reasons (they found them enjoyable or interesting), rather than extrinsic ones ("they were easy", or "they paid well"). When asked whether or not they would like to work, regardless of their present employment status, 83% and 73% of the special and regular class students, respectively, answered positively. The only other difference between these samples, which approached significance, was that more regular (42%) than special class students (9%) stated they obtained their jobs on their own; the latter obtained them with the aid of family or friends ($\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 3.22$, $\underline{p} < .08$). When asked about the type of after-school job they would like, most Ss were realistic in choosing jobs in the unskilled, semi- or skilled, and lesser white collar categories (58% and 72% for the special and regular class groups, respectively).

B. Effects of Learning Potential Status Within Special Class Sample

There was a positive linear relationship[3] between LP status i.e., nongainers, gainers, and high scorers, in that predicted order, showed increased percentages in:

1. The number of jobs S held (i.e., 47% nonEMRs[4] compared with 35% nongainers (NG), 64% gainers (G), and 75% high scorers (HS) reported they had held more than one job).

2. The proportion of students who reported they now had after school jobs ($\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 2.99$, $\underline{p} < .10$; 33% nonEMRs as compared with 30% NG, 43% G, 50% HS had jobs after school at the time of the interview).

3. Length of employment on present job, when only those who reported having jobs were considered ($\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 4.52$, $\underline{p} < .05$). Thus, though fewer nongainers reported having jobs they also tended to keep them for shorter periods of time than gainers and high scorers.

4. A higher proportion of nongainers than gainers or high scorers reported they liked their jobs in vague nonspecific terms, e.g., they were interesting (negative linear relationship, $\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 5.30$, $\underline{p} < .05$).

5. More nongainers than gainers and high scorers reported they obtained their jobs on their own or by someone asking them for assistance because "they knew that they could do it", rather than having their families obtain the jobs for them ($\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 3.59$, $\underline{p} < .06$). Even so, special class Ss still tended to use others to get their jobs, while regular class Ss tended to get their own jobs (42% nonEMRs as compared with 17% NG, 12% G, 0% HS, reported obtaining jobs on their own).

6. When asked what after-school jobs they desired, gainers wanted slightly higher level jobs than those desired by nongainers

and high scorers (72% nonEMRs compared with 72% NG, 20% G, and 75% HS desired unskilled to skilled blue collar jobs ($\underline{X}^2_{1\underline{df}}$ = 9.34, $\underline{p} < .01$).

2. Vocational Aspirations and Expectations

A. Special Versus Regular Class Comparisons

The majority of the Ss in both samples aspired to jobs which were similar to those they expected to attain after leaving school. There were few discrepancies indicated between the job level they felt their parents wanted them to attain, and the ones they stated they would attain. However, the special class sample desired and expected to obtain lower level jobs than the regular class Ss (desired: 55% of EMRs and 28% nonEMRs chose unskilled, semi- or skilled and lesser white collar jobs, $\underline{X}^2_{1\underline{df}} = 4.21$, $\underline{p} < .05$; expected to obtain: 78% EMRs and 33% nonEMRs cited jobs in these same levels, $\underline{X}^2_{1\underline{df}} = 3.18$, $\underline{p} < .10$).

B. Comparisons by LP Status Within Special Class Sample

There were differences within the special class sample by LP status. A higher proportion of high able LP EMRs (gainers and high scorers) aspired to the lower level blue collar jobs than low able LP Ss (nongainers) (28% nonEMRs, 45% NG, 62% G, 67% HS). The nongainers' desires tended to be unrealistic in that they aspired to jobs which required post-high school and even post-college education. These are more realistic choices of the regular class students. When the special class Ss were later questioned about their expected future job, the nongainers lowered their vocational choices to coincide with the lowered expectations of the special class group as a whole (34% nonEMRs, compared with 74% NG, 85% G and 76% HS expected skilled or semi-skilled blue collar jobs; the

remainder mentioned small business ownership or managerial positions, but not the professions). The nongainer, then, tended to verbalize unrealistic aspirations, unlike the gainer and high scorer. When asked to indicate his expected job, he lowered his aspiration.

When discrepancy scores were derived from the differences between the job choices S ascribed to their parents and those jobs they desired, the greatest disparities were evident for nongainers, and the least for high scorers (positive linear trend, $\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 4.04$, $p < .05$). But, interestingly, this difference was not evident when the parent-child discrepancy score was based on the child's expected job choice. Their perceptions of their parents' expectations for them were similar to those the Ss expected to attain, again suggesting that the jobs the Ss expect to attain represents some broader consensus than the child's own wish.

3. Level of Understanding of Vocational Choice

A. Special Versus Regular Class Comparison

One set of factors that might account for the differences in occupational choices between the groups was the extent to which they could convey acquaintance with and understanding of their particular job choices. First, S was asked how he heard about the particular job he had mentioned. 36% and 23% of the special and regular class students, respectively, indicated that parents, other adults or books were the source, 0% and 3% from peers, 43% and 51% "I just thought it up by myself", and 15% and 19% from TV or movies. To see how much knowledge S had about his job choice, he was asked to describe the duties involved. Rating the information given, taking into consideration that some jobs are more difficult to describe than others, 68% of the special class and 62% of the regular class students,respectively, scores high on the scale (3 of 4

of a possible 4), suggesting that a substantial proportion of both samples were able to describe the job requirements satisfactorily.

To check further whether the job choice was an arbitrary or considered choice, S was questioned on the degree of family involvement in his job choice. Sixty-four percent and 70% of the special and regular class samples said they had mentioned their future job choice to someone in their family, with 83% of the special class Ss and all the regular class Ss referring to their parents as opposed to siblings, cousins, etc. However, when asked who had helped most in thinking about a job, only 37% and 39% of the special and regular class sample, respectively, gave parent as a response.

When these scores were summed to provide an estimate of the degree of realism involved in their choice (Future Job Score), 72% and 69% of the special and regular class samples, respectively, did indicate some degree of understanding of, or contact with, the job choice they had mentioned.

B. Special Class Learning Potential Status Comparisons

There were interesting and significant differences among the LP groups within the special class sample. The regular class Ss, being somewhat younger than the special class group, tended to display a lack of familiarity with their future job choice, similar to that verbalized by the nongainers and gainers, but unlike the high scorers' responses (67% nonEMRs, 65% NG, 67% G, 32% HS).

Significantly more high scorers than nongainers and gainers said they obtained their ideas regarding their vocational choice from books, parents, or people engaged on the job (26% NG, 40% G,

50% HS, 22% nonEMR). Also, more high scorers tended to be acquainted with people involved in the vocation they chose (63% NG, 38% G, 83% HS, 55% nonEMR), but high scorers also tended to choose lower level occupations than nongainers. It is probable that there was more opportunity for familiarity with these lower level occupations.

There were no differences among the groups when the Ss were asked whether they had actually been involved with their desired job. When the results were regrouped, taking into account whether or not it was possible for S to have ever engaged in some aspect of the job (possibility was defined as a function of opportunity and degree of difficulty), there was a nonsignificant trend for more nongainers, as compared to gainers and high scorers, not to have ever been involved in their desired jobs (68% NG, 54% G, 50% HS, 45% nonEMR, not involved). There was no differences among the groups when asked to describe the duties involved in their desired jobs, even after taking into account the different degrees of difficulty in describing the different jobs. More nongainers gave either wrong or vague descriptions, while more detailed descriptions tended to be given by gainers and high scorers (42% NG, 23% G, 25% HS, 38% nonEMR , vague descriptions; nonsignificant difference).

The implication that the EMR high scorer has given more time and thought to his future job choice than any other group is supported by the fact that more high scorers than gainers and nongainers (and nonEMRs) mentioned their job choice to their family (60% NG, 50% G, 90% HS, 70% nonEMR; $\underline{X}^2_{1df} = 3.89$, $p < .05$). Of these Ss, more high scorers and gainers discussed it with their

parents as opposed to siblings, cousins, etc. (59% NG, 100% G, and HS, 39% nonEMR; $\underline{X}^2_{1\underline{df}} = 3.89$, $\underline{p} < .05$). When all responses relative to family involvement were summed, the high scorers were the only group in which a majority of the Ss scored in the upper half of the resulting distribution of scores (family involvement, future job, 45% NG, 29% G, 64% HS, and 47% nonEMR). When all the scores related to S's familiarity with his future job choice were summed, again more high scorers scored in the upper half of the distribution of scores than any other group (37% NG, 33% G, 58% HS, 33% nonEMR). Clearly, then, throughout the measures of vocational understanding the high scorer group stood apart, stating more familiarity with their desired jobs, and that they had involved their families more than the other groups.

Discussion

We found no reports of studies on part-time employment practices of high school students with which to compare the data on the special and regular class adolescents in this study. While more special class students reported they were working at the time of the interview, their mean CA was one year older, and included more older boys than the regular class sample. This difference, then, must be taken account of in the results obtained. What is very interesting is that so many special class students were employed after school, though like all students, the jobs are unskilled. The special class Ss, thus, are able to obtain and hold jobs just as any other adolescent does.

The cumulative effects of school failure and their socially stigmatized state may account for the relative lack of initiative

displayed by the special class sample in obtaining their present jobs. Several Ss stated during the interview that no one wants to hire a person who has "EMR" on his school record. Thus, the recourse to an intermediary who will vouch for them.

NonEMRs realistically had higher levels of aspiration and expectancies than EMRs. Since they are not stigmatized, and have had more success academically, they can aspire to higher level (white collar) jobs and entertain hopes of attaining them. Although there were no statistically significant differences between EMRs and nonEMRs regarding S's familiarity with his future job, this lack of difference would be due to the discrepancy in job levels aspired to, i.e., nonEMRs tended to choose white collar jobs they were unlikely to have had any contact with. The higher degree of familiarity with his vocational choice displayed by the high scorer is impressive, when compared with his gainer and nongainer peers since the EMRs did tend to expect to attain blue collar jobs with which they probably had more personal experience.

Within the special class sample, then, the findings most provocatively support the learning potential hypothesis that the students categorized as EMR on a psychometric criterion are not a homogeneous group. The LP assessment procedure did tend to differentiate among the more able and least able within this narrow IQ range. What is interesting about the high scorer is that not one said he obtained his job on his own initiative, though these students are the most able group within the special class sample by the learning potential criterion. This finding, however, is consistent with the high scorer's responses to the job aspiration questions, in that he consistently aspired to lower level jobs

and expected to obtain them. Paradoxically, perhaps, he also seemed most knowledgeably aware of his reported choice and had most frequently discussed them with his parents. A paramount impression is one of ability displayed within a motivational pattern most clearly attuned to minimizing the risk of failure, i.e., low striving but good realistic awareness of, and involvement in the future job choice. But what is disconcerting about this youngster is that he often expresses a minimal involvement in the job he presently holds. Is this a protective mechanism against failure that will characterize his involvements in the future, or purely defensive at present?

The nongainer, or low able student, by the LP criterion, tend to respond very positively initially, more similarly to the nonEMRs than his special classmates, but was not able to offer any solid evidence of having tested the reality of his responses, and hence, often gave responses that were either vaguely socially acceptable or inconsistent.[5] What distinguishes the nongainer, then, is the airy proclivity to try to make himself look like abler, higher IQ peers when he responded to the initial aspiration questions. When pressed to display more substantial understanding, however, he is unable to offer it. The responses tend to place them in Ginzberg's fantasy period, to eleven years of age. The nongainer, being in his teens, can be said to have a retarded vocational development consonant with his mental age rating, and a judgment of mental retardation seems warranted.

These differences in this nonschool-related area lend further support to the learning potential hypothesis which had previously been supported by the use of psychological tasks (Budoff, 1965, 1967, 1969; Budoff & Pagell, 1968) and a classroom laboratory

science curriculum (Budoff & Meskin, 1969). In these studies, the nongainer EMRs tended to be the subjects who did not profit from a learning experience in a manner similar to their response to the learning potential task. Their response led to the hypothesis that the nongainer functioned like a mentally retarded child, i.e., tended not to profit from experiences of some conceptual difficulty, whereas the gainer and high scorer Ss, who learned as much as low achieving, low income children with IQs in the dull-normal and average range, were hypothesized to be educationally retarded. In this study the nongainers behaved much as the mentally retarded have been described. Gainers and high scorers responded on the same or on a superior level to that of the nonEMRs, which is consistent with their slightly older chronological age. The stigmatic impact of the prior school failure is reflected in their lower aspiration and their expectation that they would obtain lower level jobs, in the main, than the more successful students.

Katzen's (1966) report that vocational realism, degree of self acceptance, and increased IQ appear related is also relevant to these differences between high scorers and nongainers. High scorers tend to have significantly higher IQs than nongainers (Budoff, 1969b). More importantly, high scorers' responses to a self report inventory indicate markedly lower factor loadings for items describing malajustment than do the responses of nongainers. These findings provide additional support for the critical distinctions made evident by the learning potential assessment which, in turn, are supported by the direction of Katzen's data.

Jones' second finding, that appropriateness of vocational choice increases with chronological age, is not evident in these

results since the CA range is narrow, and the nonEMRs are the youngest children as a group. However, it may be evident in the measures of S's knowledge of and familiarity with his future vocational choice (S's vocational development) since the high scorers and gainers were oldest and showed the greatest degree of vocational development. The results show that it was not differences in IQ that resulted in differences in realism of vocational choice. It may be that given a minimum ability level, whether determined by IQ for nonEMRs, or learning potential status for EMRs, vocational development does increase with CA.

The differences in findings between this and earlier studies reflects the critical importance of the samples used for comparisons. The prior studies which compared EMRs and nonEMRs neglected to control for social status differences between the two groups. This oversight reflects the conviction that a "dumbie is a dumbie", i.e., that the IQ-derived diagnosis made during the school years reflects a real condition. But most EMRs are from low socio-economic backgrounds and, like their social class peers, are less highly verbal in the usual sense. Failing to control for socio-economic differences tends to accentuate the comparisons between "normals" and "retardates". It should be evident that when these factors are controlled, the contrasts between these groups diminish sharply when the factors studies are not closely related to academic success.

References

Anderson, H. H. & Brandt, H. F. A study of motivation involving self announced goals of fifth grade children and concept of level of aspiration. Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, 10, 209-232.

Budoff, M. Learning potential among the educable retarded. Progress Report, National Institute of Mental Health, 1965, mimeo'd.

Budoff, M. Learning potential among institutionalized young adult retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1967, 72, 404-411.

Budoff, M. Learning potential: A supplementary procedure for assessing the ability to reason. Seminars in Psychiatry, 1969a, 1, 278-290.

Budoff, M. Social and test data correlates of learning potential status in adolescent community special students, 1969b. Unpublished manuscript.

Budoff, M. & Friedman, M. "Learning Potential" as an assessment approach to the adolescent mentally retarded. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 5, 434-439.

Budoff, M. & Meskin, J. D. An educational test of the learning potential hypothesis. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, in press.

Budoff, M. & Pagell, W. A. Learning potential and rigidity in the adolescent mentally retarded. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 479-486.

Ginzberg, E., Ginzberg, S., Axelrod, S., Herma, J. L. Occupational choice: An approach to a general theory. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Harrison, R. H. & Budoff, M. Demographic, historical and ability correlates of the Laurelton Self Concept Scale in an educable mentally retarded sample. Unpublished manuscript, 1969.

Jones, P. The relation of vocational outlook and special educational problems for adolescent educable mentally handicapped. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27 (12-A), 4078.

Katzen, S. The interaction of maternal acceptance, self-acceptance and realism of vocational goals in MR adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966.

Kuhn, E. A comparative analysis of the nature of EMR adolescents' expressed level of understanding of selected occupations. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27 (5-A), 1204.

McCoy, G. F. Some ego factors associated with academic success and failure of EMR. Exceptional Children, 1963, 30 (2), 80-84.

Turner, R. H. Social context of ambition: A study of high school seniors in Los Angeles. San Francisco: Chandler Publications, 1964.

Footnotes

1. This research was supported in part by Grant 10588 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Grant OEG-0-8-080506(032) from the Division of Research, Bureau of the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

2. 12 Maple Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02139.

3. The learning potential hypothesis predicts a linear continuum of ability, i.e., that high scorers, gainers and nongainers would show differences in adequacy in coping with a given task. This hypothesis was tested by analysis of the linear component (high scorers and gainers versus nongainers on 1 d.f.). The other d.f. was used to test the obverse of this hypothesis, the quadratic component, namely, that gainers' competence would differ from that of high scorers' and nongainers' competence. The chi-square comparisons were calculated on 1 d.f. for learning potential status.

4. The percentages indicated for the regular class sample (nonEMRs) are included for comparison purposes and were not included in the chi-square analyses cited.

5. In another study, small samples of nongainers, gainers and high scorers were asked how they would respond to frustrating situations in school, home and with peers. An open and closed-ended question was used for the same hypothetical situations. The discrepancies between types of responses was tallied for the two question formats. High able Ss by the LP criterion (gainers and high scorers) indicated

a consistency of mode of response to the hypothetical frustration in the open and closed-ended formats; nongainers tended to give more discrepant responses (F = 24.174, df = 2/24, $p < .001$).

Table 1. Means, SDs, and F-Ratios for EMR and Non-EMR Samples for IQ, CA, and Occupational Rating of Principal Wage Earner.

		IQ		CA		Mean Occup. Rating	
All Interviewed EMRs	N	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
High Scorers	12	72.83	9.89	175.42	5.27	2.25	.75
Gainers	19	66.31	7.95	171.16	11.77	2.11	1.33
Nongainers	15	72.33	3.16	173.47	11.69	2.00	.85
All Interviewed NonEMRs							
High Scorers	17	94.24	11.41	158.94	12.11	2.35	1.32
Gainers	8	85.63	8.63	160.25	11.47	1.38	1.51
Nongainers	8	94.88	6.71	154.37	11.66	1.88	1.81

	df	F	F	F
EMR Status	1	132.63**	34.73**	0.15
LP Status	2	6.09*	0.43	1.13
EMR x LP	2	0.20	0.79	0.72
Residual Mean Square	73	72.30	122.30	1.57

* - $p < .01$
** - $p < .001$